

1 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332)
2 United States Attorney

3 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 BENJAMIN P. TOLKOFF (NYBN 4294443)
6 Assistant United States Attorney

7 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
8 San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7296
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
Email: Benjamin.Tolkoff@usdoj.gov

9
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No.: CR 09-0764 VRW
16 Plaintiff,)
17 v.) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
18 JOSE RODRIGUEZ-ANTECON,) EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY
19) TRIAL ACT, 18 U.S.C. § 3161
20 Defendant.)
21

22 On October 1, 2009, the parties appeared before the Court and set a schedule for motions
23 briefing. At that time the parties agreed and the Court ordered that this matter be continued until
24 November 5, 2009, to afford adequate preparation of counsel and assure continuity of counsel.
25 The parties agree that, taking into account the public interest in prompt disposition of criminal
26 cases, good cause exists for this extension.

27 The defendant also agrees to exclude for this period of time any time limits applicable
28 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the

1 reasonable time necessary for continuity of counsel and effective preparation. 18 U.S.C. §
2 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a
3 continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18
4 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

5 SO STIPULATED:

6 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
7 United States Attorney

9 DATED: October 1, 2009

/s/

10 BENJAMIN P. TOLKOFF
Assistant United States Attorney

12 DATED: October 1, 2009

/s/

13 JODI LINKER
Attorney for JOSE RODRIGUEZ-ANTECON

15 [PROPOSED] ORDER

16 For the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the continuation of this matter from
17 October 1, 2009 to November 5, 2009, is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the
18 continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18
19 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(7)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the
20 defendant effective preparation of counsel, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. 18
21 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 DATED: 10/16/2009

